UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United	d States of America,		Case No\	8-67-322-	SI
	Plaintiff, v.	JUL)18	STIPULATI 2018	とって・322 - ED ORDER EXCLUDIO E SPEEDY TRIAL AC	NG TIME T
	Defendant(s).	SUSAN Y. CLERK, U.9. DIS NORTHERN DISTRIC	SOONG FRICT COURT T OF CALIFORNIA		
For the reason Trial Act from continuance of 3161(h)(7)(A)	ns stated by the parties on the n Soly 18, 2018 to Asoutweigh the best interest of the Court makes this finding.	record on 2018 ne public and the negand bases to	and finds that the defendant in this continuance	the Court excludes time the ends of justice serv a speedy trial. <i>See</i> 18 to on the following factor	under the Speedy ed by the U.S.C. § (s):
	Failure to grant a continuan See 8 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(E		kely to result in	a miscarriage of justice).
·	The case is so unusual or so defendants, the natur or law, that it is unreasonab itself within the time limits	e of the prosect ad	eution, orequate preparat	the existence of novel of ion for pretrial proceedi	questions of fact ings or the trial
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
	Failure to grant a continuant counsel's other scheduled ca See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(I	ase commitme			
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
IT IS S	SO ORDERED.				
DATED: 190					
				EELER Judge Magistrate Judge	
STIPU	LATED: Attorney for Defen	dant	Assistant Un	ited States Attorney	
	1 thorney for Deter	aulit	1 issistant On	noa biatog/morney	